



U.S. Department of Agriculture
Forest Service
333 SW 1st Avenue, P.O. Box 3623
Portland, OR 97208

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
333 SW 1st Avenue, P.O. Box 2965
Portland, OR 97208

January 2004

Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement
MANAGEMENT OF PORT-ORFORD-CEDAR
IN SOUTHWEST OREGON



*Coos Bay, Medford, and Roseburg Bureau of Land Management Districts
and the Siskiyou National Forest in Southwest Oregon*

MANAGEMENT OF PORT-ORFORD-CEDAR IN SOUTHWEST OREGON
Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement



UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Oregon State Office
333 S.W. First Avenue
P.O. Box 2965
Portland, Oregon 97208

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

PRIORITY MAIL
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
Bureau of Land Management
Permit No. G-76

As the Nation’s principle conservation agency, the Department of the Interior has responsibility for most of our nationally owned public lands and natural resources. This includes fostering the wisest use of our land and water resources, protecting our fish and wildlife, preserving the environmental and cultural values of our national parks and historical places, and providing for the enjoyment of life through outdoor recreation. The department assesses our energy and mineral resources and works to assure that their development is in the best interest of all our people. The Department also has a major responsibility for American Indian reservation communities and for people who live in Island Territories under U.S. Administration.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, or marital or family status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA’s TARGET Center at 202-720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call 202-720-5694 (voice or TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.



U.S. Department of Agriculture
Forest Service
333 SW 1st Avenue, P.O. Box 3623
Portland, OR 97208



U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
333 SW 1st Avenue, P.O. Box 2965
Portland, OR 97208

January 2004

Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

MANAGEMENT OF PORT-ORFORD-CEDAR IN SOUTHWEST OREGON

*Coos Bay, Medford, and Roseburg Bureau of Land Management Districts
and the Siskiyou National Forest in Southwest Oregon*

Lead Agencies: Bureau of Land Management – U.S. Department of the Interior
Siskiyou National Forest – U.S. Department of Agriculture

Cooperating Agency: Forest Service Region 5, U.S. Department of Agriculture

Information Contact: Ken Denton, Port-Orford-cedar SEIS Team
P.O. Box 2965, Portland, OR 97208
503-326-2368
e-mail: ORPOCEIS@or.blm.gov

We approve publication of this final supplemental environmental impact statement and the identification of Alternative 2 as the Bureau of Land Management proposed resource management plan amendment and Forest Service preferred alternative.

Elaine M. Brong
State Director
BLM Oregon/Washington

Scott Conroy
Forest Supervisor
Rogue River and Siskiyou National Forests

United States Department of Agriculture	Forest Service	R-6	OR/ WA	Bureau of Land Management	United States Department of Interior
--	---------------------------	------------	-------------------	--	---

Reply Refer To: 3400 (FS)/5820 (BLM) (OR-935)

Date: January 9, 2003

Dear Interested Party:

In accordance with the "Federal Land Policy and Management Act," the "National Forest Management Act," and the "National Environmental Policy Act", the Bureau and Land management and the Forest Service (Siskiyou National Forest) have prepared the attached Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for Management of Port-Orford-Cedar in Southwest Oregon. The final SEIS supplements the environmental impact statements for the resource management plans (Plans) of the Coos Bay, Medford, and Roseburg BLM Districts and the land and resource management plan (Plan) for the Siskiyou National Forest. Alternative 2, as modified from the draft SEIS and described in the final SEIS, is the Forest Service Preferred Alternative for amending the Siskiyou National Forest Plan, and the BLM Proposed Plan Amendment for the three BLM District Plans.

The draft SEIS was made available for 90-day public comment period June 13 through September 12, 2003. Four comments were received in the month and a half after September 12, for a total of 49 letters; all were included in the SEIS. The four letters from governments or agencies are shown in their entirety in Appendix 11. Over 600 substantive comments were identified in the 49 letters. These comments were often rephrased for clarity or combination of like comments, and are presented in Appendix 10 along with the Agencies' responses. The Interdisciplinary Team found the bulk of these comment letters to be informative and well thought-out, supplying additional information or pointing out deficiencies in the original analysis. The Team sincerely appreciates the many hours various members of the public obviously spent studying the draft in detail. A summary of major changes made between draft and final SEIS appears at the start of each chapter. The Agencies hope each commenter finds the SEIS appropriately improved as a result of their efforts.

Additional copies of the Final SEIS can be obtained from the Interdisciplinary Team at the "information contact" listed on the cover page, or on the web at http://www.or.blm.gov/planning/port-orford-cedar_seis/

Forest Service Appeal Procedures

Unlike the BLM, the Forest Service appeal procedures run for 30 days following issuance of the Forest Service record of decision. A detailed description of those procedures will be included in the Forest Service record of decision when it is issued in early 2004.

Bureau of Land Management Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment Protest Procedures

Alternative 2, without any of the additional mitigation measures presented on Table 2-6, is the BLM Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment. Alternative 2 would establish standards and guidelines to be followed by the Districts on all projects (as applicable), and a methodology for clarifying environmental conditions that require implementation of site-specific practices. Project proposals in or directly affecting the currently uninfested 163 7th field (1,700 to 6,000 acre) watersheds would automatically be considered for application of the management practices, if the proposed activity would pose a significant risk of infecting Port-Orford-cedar in the watershed. The Alternative is completely described in Chapter 2 of the attached final SEIS.

You now have the opportunity to protest the Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment described here and in the Final SEIS. The BLM Planning Regulations, 43 CFR 1610.5-2, state that any person who participated in the planning process and has an interest which may be adversely affected may protest the proposed planning decision(s). A protest may raise only those issues that were submitted for the record during the planning process. Protests must be filed within 30 days of the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes its Notice of Availability of the Final SEIS in the *Federal Register*. The Notice is expected to be published January 9, 2004, and the protest period to close February 8, 2004. If these dates change, the specific protest period closure date will be announced through the Port-Orford-cedar website (address above) and by postcards or letters sent through regular mail, or by e-mail as some people have indicated to us, to the 49 people and agencies who provided public comments and any others who may have only provided scoping comments. To be considered timely, your protest must be postmarked no later than the last day of the protest period. Though not a requirement, we suggest that you send your protest by certified mail, return receipt requested. Written protests must be submitted to the following address:

Director, Bureau of Land Management
Attention: Ms. Brenda Williams, Protests Coordinator
WO-210/LS-1075
Department of the Interior
Washington DC 20240

To expedite delivery in the Washington, DC area, you may wish to send your protest via one of the express air delivery services to:

Director, Bureau of Land Management
Attention: Ms. Brenda Williams, Protests Coordinator
WO-210
1620 L Street NW, Suite 1075
Washington DC 20236

You may wish to send a copy of the protest (in addition to the original sent via regular mail or express delivery) by FAX or e-mail to Ms. Brenda Williams at:

FAX: (202) 452-5112 or e-mail: bhudgets@wo.blm.gov

You are also encouraged (but not required) to forward a copy of your protest to the SEIS Team at the *information contact* address listed on the cover page of the Final SEIS. This may allow us to resolve the protest through clarification of intent or alternative dispute resolution methods. To be considered complete, your protest must contain the following information at a minimum:

- 1) Name, mailing address, phone number and the affected interest of the person filing the protest.
- 2) A statement of the issue(s) being protested.
- 3) A statement of the part(s) of the proposed plan being protested. To the extent possible, reference specific pages, paragraphs, and sections of the document.
- 4) A copy of all your documents addressing the issue or issues which were discussed with the BLM (IDT) for the record.
- 5) A concise statement explaining why the proposed decision is believed to be incorrect. This is a critical part of your protest. Document all relevant facts, as much as possible. A protest that merely expresses disagreement with the State Director's proposed decision, without providing any supporting data, will not be considered a valid protest.

For additional information or clarification regarding this document of the planning protest process, please contact Ken Denton at:

Port-Orford-cedar SEIS Team
P.O. Box 2965, Portland, OR 97208
or:
ORPOCEIS@or.blm.gov
or:
(503) 326-2368.

Comments and protests on the Proposed RMP Amendments, including names and street addresses, will be available for public review at the BLM State Office Reading Room, 333 SW 1st Street, Portland, Oregon 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday except Federal holidays. Individual respondents may request confidentiality. If you wish to withhold your name or street address from public review or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your written comment/protest. Such request will be honored to the extent allowed by law. All submissions from organization and businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, will be available for public inspection in their entirety.

Sincerely,



KENNETH E. DENTON
SEIS Team Leader
Port-Orford-cedar SEIS Team

Abstract

*The Coos Bay, Medford, and Roseburg Bureau of Land Management Districts and the Siskiyou National Forest are proposing to amend their respective land and resource management plans with standards and guidelines for the management of Port-Orford-cedar and the root disease, *Phytophthora lateralis*. This final supplemental environmental impact statement considers six alternatives for maintenance of Port-Orford-cedar as an ecologically and economically significant species. Each alternative responds to the Purpose, to the degree such treatments are needed, practical, and cost-effective, of reducing disease introductions, slowing the spread of the disease where present, and/or mitigating the occurrence of the disease. Alternative 1 continues the current direction of implementing available disease-management practices based on site-specific analysis. Alternative 2 uses the same management practices, but places additional emphasis on 162 uninfested 7th field watersheds, and includes a risk key to clarify the environmental conditions that require implementation of site-specific practices. Alternative 3 includes all elements of Alternative 2, and adds additional protections for 31 currently uninfested 6th field watersheds. Alternative 4 removes existing disease management practices, but accelerates the resistant breeding program to provide resistant stock for all areas within 10 years. Alternative 5 removes existing disease management practices, and stops development of resistant seed for remaining undeveloped breeding zones. Alternative 6 includes all elements of Alternative 2, and adds additional protections for 162 currently uninfested 7th field watersheds.*

Major issues include the effectiveness of the proposed management techniques, the extent of negative effects from cedar mortality on other resource uses or values, and the degree of necessity of restricting other forest uses to reduce disease spread. In general, Alternatives 2, 3, and 6 improve conditions for water, fish, wildlife, rare plants, Tribal collections, and plant diversity, and adversely affect recreation access, special forest product collection, timber harvest, fire suppression and fuels management, and costs as compared to the present condition (Alternative 1). The less restrictive Alternatives 4 and 5 have the opposite effect. A major finding of the analysis is that Port-Orford-cedar is not in danger of extirpation under any of the alternatives.

Alternative 2 is the preferred alternative.

Table of Contents

Summary —

Introduction and Need	S-1
Why Is the Action Being Proposed?	S-2
What Would It Mean Not to Meet the Need?	S-2
What Action is Proposed?	S-2
Are There Other Alternatives that Would Meet the Need?	S-3
What Are the Effects of the Alternatives?	S-3
Can Any of the Adverse Effects be Mitigated?	S-5
What Factors Will Be Used in Making the Decision Between Alternatives?	S-6
What Monitoring is Necessary?	S-7
Which Alternative is the Preferred/Proposed RMP Amendment?	S-7

Chapter 1 — Introduction, Purpose, and Need

Introduction	1-1
Changes Between Draft and Final	1-1
Background	1-1
The Need	1-5
The Purpose	1-5
Issues	1-6
Scoping	1-7

Chapter 2 — The Alternatives

Introduction	2-1
Changes Between Draft and Final	2-1
Background/Existing Port-Orford-Cedar Standards and Guidelines	2-2
The Sandy-Remote Lawsuit	2-5
The Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement	2-6
Endangered Species Consultation	2-7
The Planning Area	2-7
Relationship of Alternatives to Existing Management Plans	2-8
Bureau of Land Management	2-8
Forest Service	2-8
The Alternatives	2-9
Overview	2-9
Standards and Guidelines for Each Alternative	2-11
Alternative 1 — Continue Existing Direction	2-11
Alternative 2 — General Direction Plus Risk Key (Proposed Action)	2-14
Alternative 3 — Port-Orford-Cedar Cores and Buffers in 6th Field Watersheds	2-23
Alternative 4 — Passive Project Management with Accelerated Resistance Breeding	2-25
Alternative 5 — Passive Project Management with Reduced Resistance Breeding	2-27
Alternative 6 — Port-Orford-Cedar Cores and Buffers in 7th Field Watersheds	2-27

Alternatives Considered But Eliminated From Detailed Study	2-30
Comparison of the Effects of the Alternatives	2-40
Potential Mitigation Measures	2-46

Chapter 3&4 — Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences

Introduction	3&4-1
Changes Between Draft and Final	3&4-2
Incomplete and Unavailable Information	3&4-2
Cumulative Effects	3&4-5
California Portion of the Range	3&4-7
Siuslaw National Forest, Oregon Caves National Monument	3&4-8
Port-Orford-Cedar Management on Non-Federal Lands in Oregon	3&4-8
Timber Harvest on Private Lands Within the Range of Port-Orford-Cedar	3&4-9
Temporal Effects	3&4-11
Past Harvest and Mortality of Port-Orford-Cedar, All Lands	3&4-12
Relationship of this Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement to the Northwest Forest Plan	3&4-12
Encumbered Forest Roads	3&4-15
Assumptions and Clarifications	3&4-16
Planting Assumption	3&4-18
Port-Orford-Cedar Background	3&4-19
Species Range	3&4-19
Autecology	3&4-19
Geomorphic Position	3&4-20
Moisture Regime	3&4-20
Summary of Limitations on Distribution	3&4-20
Life History	3&4-21
Historical Setting	3&4-21
Distribution Across the Range	3&4-22
North Coast Risk Region	3&4-22
Inland Siskiyou Risk Region	3&4-25
Siskiyou Risk Region	3&4-26
Disjunct California Risk Region	3&4-29
Port-Orford-Cedar Acreage Data	3&4-29
Geographic Information System	3&4-29
Current Vegetation Survey	3&4-32
Aerial Mortality and Defoliation Surveys — Oregon	3&4-33
Resource Elements That Address Issues	3&4-34
Introduction	3&4-34
Pathology	3&4-34
Ultramafic Soils	3&4-52
Ecology and Plant Associations	3&4-54
Botany	3&4-71
Water and Fisheries	3&4-76
Wildlife	3&4-98
Pacific Yew	3&4-105
Genetics and Resistance	3&4-106
Fire and Fuels	3&4-125

Air Quality	3&4-136
Recreation, Visual, Wilderness, and Wild and Scenic Rivers	3&4-136
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern and Research Natural Areas	3&4-140
Culturally Significant Products for American Indian Tribes	3&4-142
Special Forest Products	3&4-144
Timber Harvest	3&4-147
Livestock Grazing	3&4-153
Mining	3&4-154
Costs	3&4-156
Environmental Justice	3&4-160
Civil Rights Impact Assessment	3&4-162
Critical Elements of the Human Environment	3&4-164
Other Environmental Consequences	3&4-164

Chapter 5 — Preparers, References, Glossary, Distribution List, and Index

Changes Between Draft and Final	5-1
Preparers	5-1
Port-Orford-Cedar-SEIS Core Team	5-1
Technical Specialists	5-2
Technical Consultant	5-5
Administrative and Technical Support	5-5
References	5-7
Glossary	5-29
Distribution List	5-45
Index	5-49

Appendices

Changes Between Draft and Final	A-1
Appendix 1: Port-Orford-Cedar Management Guidelines	A-1
I. Introduction	A-4
II. <i>Phytophthora lateralis</i> and Port-Orford-Cedar	A-4
III. <i>Phytophthora lateralis</i> and Pacific Yew	A-5
IV. Management Objectives for Port-Orford-Cedar	A-5
V. Implementation Strategy to Achieve Port-Orford-Cedar Management Objectives	A-6
VI. Mitigation Measures for Timber Sale and Service Contracts	A-12

Appendix 2: Summary of Agency Actions for Fiscal Years 2001 and 2002

Under the Existing Direction for Port-Orford-Cedar	A-24
Overview of Current Port-Orford-Cedar Program Implementation	A-24
Existing Programmatic Actions	A-27

Appendix 3: Port-Orford-Cedar Standards and Guidelines in the Land and Resource Management Plans in Region 5

(SEIS Cooperating Agencies) and the Siuslaw National Forest	A-31
Existing Direction — Six Rivers National Forest	A-31
Existing Direction — Klamath National Forest	A-37
Existing Direction — Shasta-Trinity National Forest	A-38

Existing Direction — Siuslaw National Forest	A-39
Appendix 4: Clorox Use, Toxicity, Potential Environmental Effects, and Label Information	A-40
Introduction and Use	A-40
Toxicity and Potential Environmental Effects	A-40
Clorox Label Information	A-42
Appendix 5: Monitoring Plans for Each Alternative	A-44
Alternative 1	A-44
Alternatives 2–6	A-44
Appendix 6: Resistant Port-Orford-Cedar Planting and Growth Assumptions	A-46
Appendix 7: Biological Evaluations	A-50
Wildlife	A-50
Botany	A-62
Fisheries	A-69
Appendix 8: Areas of Critical Environmental Concern and Research Natural Areas and Requirements for Designation	A-75
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	A-75
Research Natural Areas	A-77
Appendix 9: Summary of Modeled Potential Stream Temperature Increases Resulting from Port-Orford-Cedar Mortality	A-80
Appendix 10: Response to Public Comments	A-81
Introduction	A-81
Organization	A-81
Public Comments and Agency Responses	A-83
Summary	A-83
Chapter 1	A-83
Chapter 2	A-92
Chapter 3&4	A-119
Chapter 5	A-170
Appendices	A-171
Appendix 11: Reprinted Comment Letters from Governmental Entities	A-177
Appendix 12: Port-Orford-Cedar Disease-Free Watersheds	A-186
Appendix 13: Equipment Cleaning Checklist	A-191

Tables

Table S-1.— <i>Summary of alternatives considered in detail</i>	S-1
Table S-2.— <i>Summary and comparison of the environmental consequences [effects] of the alternatives</i>	S-4
Table 2-1.— <i>Port-Orford-Cedar Risk Key: Site-specific analysis to help determine where risk reduction management practices would be applied</i>	2-18
Table 2-2.— <i>Alternative 3, summary of 6th field watershed cores and buffers</i>	2-24
Table 2-3.— <i>Alternative 6, summary of 7th field watershed cores and buffers</i>	2-28
Table 2-4.— <i>100-year infestation prediction for Oregon by alternative</i>	2-42
Table 2-5.— <i>Summary and comparison of the environmental consequences [effects] of the alternatives</i>	2-45
Table 2-6.— <i>Identified adverse environmental effects and possible mitigation measures</i>	2-48
Table 3&4-1.— <i>Average yearly private harvest levels for all species within the natural range of Port-Orford-cedar, 1995–2001</i>	3&4-10
Table 3&4-2.— <i>Port-Orford-cedar standing inventory and harvest volume for private lands</i>	3&4-11
Table 3&4-3.— <i>Gross Oregon Federal and presence of Port-Orford-cedar [acres] by Northwest Forest Plan land allocation within the natural range of Port-Orford-cedar in Oregon</i>	3&4-14
Table 3&4-4.— <i>Port-Orford-cedar acres on BLM and FS lands grouped by ecoregion and pathology risk regions, Oregon and California</i>	3&4-22
Table 3&4-5.— <i>Geographic information system-mapped Port-Orford-cedar and Phytophthora lateralis infestation acreage on BLM and FS, post-Biscuit Fire</i>	3&4-30
Table 3&4-6.— <i>Current Vegetation Survey: Summary from Forest Inventory Plots of live and dead POC trees</i>	3&4-33
Table 3&4-7.— <i>Summary of aerial mortality and defoliation survey results for Port-Orford-cedar in Oregon, 2000–2002</i>	3&4-33
Table 3&4-8.— <i>Percent of currently healthy drainages [infested high-risk areas] predicted to become infested within 100 years by alternative</i>	3&4-47
Table 3&4-9.— <i>Infested and infection estimates, Oregon</i>	3&4-52
Table 3&4-10.— <i>100-year infestation prediction for Oregon by alternative</i>	3&4-53
Table 3&4-11.— <i>Average abundance [as indicated by percent cover] of Port-Orford-cedar in plant association groups where POC is prominent in the overstory</i>	3&4-58
Table 3&4-12.— <i>Estimated acreages of stands with Port-Orford-cedar prominent in the overstory and infected acres [in parentheses] by geographic area and plant association group</i>	3&4-59
Table 3&4-13.— <i>Average abundance [as indicated by percent cover] of Port-Orford-cedar in plant association groups where Port-Orford-cedar is prominent in the overstory</i>	3&4-59
Table 3&4-14.— <i>Snags and downed woody material by plant association group</i>	3&4-61

Table 3&4-15.— <i>Relationship of Port-Orford-cedar ecoregions/ geographic areas to risk regions [in acres] where Port-Orford-cedar is prominent in the overstory</i>	3&4-62
Table 3&4-16.— <i>Species richness of plant associations containing Port-Orford-cedar by geographic area and plant association group [in average number of plants]</i>	3&4-64
Table 3&4-17.— <i>Predicted infestation acres in 100 years by subdivisions of plant association groups where Port-Orford-cedar is prominent in the overstory</i>	3&4-66
Table 3&4-18.— <i>Riparian and stream attributes in differing morphologies and relationship to Phytophthora lateralis</i>	3&4-88
Table 3&4-19.— <i>Regional hydrologic/aquatic differences and effects from Port-Orford-Cedar-infection</i>	3&4-90
Table 3&4-20.— <i>Numbers of wildlife species associated with the Southwest Oregon-Mixed Conifer habitat type</i>	3&4-100
Table 3&4-21.— <i>Projected resistant seed availability per breeding zone by alternative</i>	3&4-111
Table 3&4-22.— <i>Acres by Northwest Forest Plan land allocation and administrative unit within the range of Port-Orford-cedar in Oregon</i>	3&4-147
Table 3&4-23.— <i>Annual probable sale quantity [PSQ] in millions of board feet annually by administrative unit and within the range of Port-Orford-cedar</i>	3&4-148
Table 3&4-24a.— <i>Alternative 3 Port-Orford-cedar core acres and resultant PSQ reduction for Oregon</i>	3&4-151
Table 3&4-24b.— <i>Alternative 6 Port-Orford-cedar core acres and resultant PSQ reduction for Oregon</i>	3&4-152
Table 3&4-25.— <i>Livestock grazing allotments within the range of Port-Orford-cedar on BLM- and FS-administered lands</i>	3&4-154
Table 3&4-26.— <i>Summary of average annual Port-Orford-cedar program costs [\$] by category and alternative</i>	3&4-157
Table 3&4-27.— <i>Demographic statistics within the Oregon portion of the range of Port-Orford-cedar [2000 Census]</i>	3&4-161
Table 3&4-28.— <i>Average earnings and unemployment rate for the Oregon counties within the range of POC</i>	3&4-161
Table 3&4-29.— <i>Critical elements of the human environment</i>	3&4-165
Table A7-1.— <i>BLM special status and FS sensitive animal species that are documented or suspected to occur within the Coos Bay, Medford, and Roseburg BLM Districts and the Siskiyou National Forest</i>	A-59
Table A7-2.— <i>Threatened [T] or endangered [E] vascular plants within the range of Port-orford-cedar</i>	A-65
Table A7-3.— <i>Vascular plants listed as BLM Bureau sensitive/assessment and Forest Service sensitive documented or suspected within close proximity of Port-Orford-cedar</i>	A-66
Table A8-1.— <i>Areas of critical environmental concern and research natural areas within the range of Port-Orford-cedar in Oregon that contain healthy Port-Orford-cedar or are infested with Phytophthora lateralis</i>	A-75

Table A8-2.— <i>Areas of critical environmental concern and research natural areas within the range of Port-Orford-cedar in Oregon that contain healthy Port-Orford-cedar or are infested with Phytophthora lateralis</i>	A-76
Table A9-1.— <i>Mortality parameters for SHADOW stream temperature effects</i>	A-80
Table A9-2.— <i>Summary of predicted shade decrease and temperature increase for August 1, comparison of uninfested and infested riparian areas with 100 percent Port-Orford-cedar</i>	A-80
Table A10-1.— <i>Draft POC-SEIS public comment period respondents</i>	A-82
Table A12-1.— <i>Port-Orford-cedar disease-free 6th field (Alternative 3) watersheds</i>	A-186
Table A12-2.— <i>Port-Orford-cedar disease-free 7th field (Alternative 6) watersheds</i>	A-187

Figures

Figure 1-1.— <i>The natural range of Port-Orford-cedar</i>	1-2
Figure 2-1.— <i>Current acres of Port-Orford-cedar in Oregon and predicted acres of infestations at 100 years by alternative</i>	2-44
Figure 3&4-1.— <i>Progression of Port-Orford-cedar root disease within a drainage after Phytophthora lateralis is introduced and becomes established</i>	3&4-44
Figure 3&4-2.— <i>Port-Orford-cedar breeding blocks</i>	3&4-109

Maps

Map 1: <i>Alternative 3 – Uninfested 6th-Field Watersheds Showing Port-Orford-Cedar Locations and Northwest Forest Plan Land Allocations</i>
Map 2: <i>Alternative 6 – Uninfested 7th-Field Watersheds, Showing Port-Orford-Cedar Locations and Northwest Forest Plan Land Allocations</i>
Map 3: <i>Phytophthora lateralis and Port-Orford-Cedar by Northwest Forest Plan Land Allocation for the Oregon Portions of the Range</i>
Map 4: <i>Port-Orford-Cedar Occurrence and Range, and Ecoregions Table</i>

Acronyms/Abbreviations

ACEC ~ Area of Critical Environmental Concern
BLM ~ Bureau of Land Management
CVS ~ Current Vegetation Survey
EA ~ Environmental Assessment
EIS ~ Environmental Impact Statement
FS ~ Forest Service
GIS ~ Geographic (mapping) Information System
LSR ~ Late-Successional Reserve
NF ~ National Forest
NOAA Fisheries ~ National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration-Fisheries (formerly NMFS-National Marine Fisheries Service)
NRA ~ National Recreation Area
POC ~ Port-Orford-cedar
PL ~ *Phytophthora lateralis*
PSQ ~ Probable Sale Quantity
RNA ~ Research Natural Area
RMP ~ Resource Management Plan
Region 6 ~ Forest Service Region generally covering Oregon and Washington
Region 5 ~ Forest Service Region generally covering California
SEIS ~ Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement
USFWS ~ U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
U.S. ~ United States

Summary —

Introduction and Need

Port-Orford-cedar (POC) is a unique conifer growing only in Southwestern Oregon and Northwestern California. For a variety of reasons, including its ability to tolerate ultramafic (serpentine) soils and live along streams and other wet sites, it plays a significant ecological role in some forest communities. POC also supplies unique forest products, including wooden arrow stock, wood for Japanese soaking tubs and temples, aromatic storage boxes for American Indian ceremonial materials, and long-lasting cedar boughs. In 1952 an exotic root disease was identified killing the cedar near Coos Bay. Since that time the disease has spread across much of its range, killing POC and threatening to reduce its ecological function and product availability.

The Agencies have a Need for the maintenance of POC as an ecologically and economically significant species on Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and National Forest (NF) lands. Currently, direction in existing land and resource management plans places an emphasis on reducing the spread of POC root disease and maintaining POC through use of a wide variety of management practices, generally applied at the project level following site-specific analysis. This supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS) examines the environmental consequences of the current direction and five other alternatives.

Why is the Action Being Proposed?

The existing POC management direction was included in Agency land and resource management plans adopted in 1989 and 1995, with little visible analysis regarding how well that direction would work at the range-wide and long-term scales. The direction generally incorporates BLM or references Forest Service (FS) guidelines and policies directing development and application of all practicable management practices to control the spread of the root disease, and to develop disease-resistant trees through a breeding program to help replace trees lost to the disease.

However, in March, 2002 a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit found that a BLM project-specific environmental analysis had not adequately considered cumulative effects to the health of POC over its entire range in view of reasonably foreseeable actions of the Agency and others. A follow-up decision by the U.S. District Court of the District of Oregon ruled that the EIS for the Coos Bay District resource management plan was inadequate under the “National Environmental Policy Act” (NEPA) because it did not include an analysis of reasonable foreseeable future timber sales and other actions on the root disease and POC. The Court went on to enjoin timber sale activities and related road building and maintenance in the project area until

... BLM completes adequate analysis of the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on *Phytophthora lateralis* and Port-Orford-cedar.

It is important to note that the Court did not necessarily find a deficiency with the current management direction itself, only that the analysis supporting it was inadequate. This SEIS supplies the missing analysis, and presents alternatives to the current direction for analysis as well, in order to provide a context (or range of effects) from which the decision-makers can make an informed choice about the level of disease control needed.

What Would It Mean Not to Meet the Need?

One of two major objectives of the SEIS is to identify and define the ecological and economic role of POC. The ecological role of POC is described in the Affected Environment SEIS sections for botany, water, fisheries, wildlife, and soils. Other SEIS sections cover economically significance with respect to timber harvest, special forest products, recreation, and other areas. The analysis indicates that with a “passive management” alternative (Alternative 5 in the SEIS), root disease progression would lead to stream temperatures above State standards in some ultramafic soil areas, significant mortality for some populations of endangered coho salmon, loss of shade or physical protection for some rare or unique plants growing in POC plant communities, possible loss of rare genes, and POC mortality that would detract from recreation, wilderness, and other values. However, even this alternative would not lead to extirpation of POC or loss of unique genetic variations.

As a result of the analysis, Alternative 5 arguably does not meet the Need. However, ecological and economic significance is a continuum, with no specific level of effects dictating a “yes/no” point. It appears that a fairly wide range of alternatives could meet the Need, although alternatives that are overly restrictive would affect the Agencies’ ability to meet other multiple-use objectives. The analysis displays the positive and negative impacts of each alternative, and it will be up to the decision-makers to choose one that meets the Need, and best meets the Purpose of supplying the most cost-efficient balance of positive and negative effects.

What Action is Proposed?

The Agencies propose to amend the land and resource management plans for the Coos Bay, Medford, and Roseburg BLM Districts and the Siskiyou NF by removing the existing direction for management of POC root disease and replacing it with the direction in Alternative 2. Alternative 2 describes all currently available disease-control practices, dividing them between those that should be applied generally and those that may, depending upon site conditions, be applied to specific management activities. For the latter group, a risk key is included to clarify the environmental conditions that require implementation of one or more of the listed disease-controlling management practices. POC stands in the 162 currently uninfested 7th field watersheds are highlighted for protection under the risk key as well. The differences, when compared with the current direction, are a more consistent implementation of available treatments based on the risk key, and an emphasis placed on keeping PL out of currently uninfested 7th field watersheds. Alternative 2 is described in detail in Chapter 2.

Are There Other Alternatives that Would Meet the Need?

Yes. Many comments were received during the scoping phase for this project (February 10 through March 12, 2003), and during the public comment period for the draft SEIS (June 13 through September 12, 2003). Commenters suggested various ideas for meeting the Need, and many of these were incorporated into alternatives considered in detail. Of the six alternatives considered in detail in this SEIS and summarized in Table S-1, several appear to meet the Need.

What are the Effects of the Alternatives?

The major environmental consequences (effects, or impacts) of the six alternatives are discussed in detail in Chapter 3&4 and summarized on Table S-2. A major finding of the analysis is that POC is not in danger of extirpation under any of the alternatives. POC is at significant risk of root disease infection only on high-risk sites. High-risk sites are low-lying wet areas that are located downslope from already infested areas or below likely sites for future introductions, especially roads. They include streams, drainage ditches, gullies, swamps, seeps, ponds, lakes, and concave low-lying areas where water collects during rainy weather. (POC away from such areas, or near streams or bodies of water, but whose roots do not extend below the high watermark for flooding, are at low risk of infection.)

Table S-1.—Summary of alternatives considered in detail

Alternative	Project Analysis	Practices to be Applied	Resistance Breeding ¹
1 - Current Direction	Site-specific.	All known disease-control practices, as needed, and resistant seedling planting as available. Includes many not described in Standards and Guidelines.	Current level
2 - Proposed Action/Proposed resource management amendment	Site-specific with risk key to guide analysis and set limits.	All known disease-control practices, as needed, and resistant seedling planting as available. Current practices are all described in Standards and Guidelines. Emphasis added for 162 currently uninfested 7th field watersheds.	Current level
3	Site-specific with risk key to guide analysis and set limits.	All known disease-control practices, as needed, and resistant seedling planting as available. Current practices are all described in Standards and Guidelines. Also identifies 31 currently uninfested 6th field watersheds for further access limitations and no timber harvest in POC stands.	Current level
4	Site-specific only to determine where to use resistant stock.	Only planting of resistant stock where mortality has had the most adverse impact. No disease-control practices.	Accelerated level
5	Site-specific only to determine where to use existing resistant stock.	Only planting of existing resistant stock where mortality has had the most adverse impact. No disease-control practices.	Use existing developed sources only
6	Site-specific with risk key to guide analysis and set limits.	All known disease control practices, as needed, and resistant seedling planting as available. Current practices are all described in Standards and Guidelines. Also identifies 162 currently uninfested 7th field watersheds for further access limitations and no timber harvest in POC stands.	Current level

¹ Current level will develop disease-resistance seed for all breeding zones within 45 years. Accelerated level will develop this same seed within 10 years. Use of existing developed sources only will maintain the existing seed orchard covering 5 of the 19 breeding zones in Oregon, but stop any further field identification of resistant parents and development of additional zones.

Table S-2.—Summary and comparison of the environmental consequences [effects] of the alternatives

Resource/Topic	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5	Alternative 6
Pathology	57,300 acres [21%] infested in 100 years, 64% of high risk riparian.	51,600 acres [19%] infested in 100 years, 58% of high risk riparian.	45,800 acres [17%] infested in 100 years, 51% of high risk riparian.	80,300 acres [30%] infested in 100 years, 90% of high risk riparian.	80,300 acres [30%] infested in 100 years, 90% of high risk riparian.	44,700 acres [16%] infested in 100 years, 50% of high risk riparian.
Ecology and Plant Associations	Possible losses in species diversity and ecological function in one or more of 64 identified plant associations where POC is a prominent component; more of a concern in ultramafic soils where POC is a component; effect by alternative is proportional to acres infested. Some rare and/or riparian plant associations could suffer substantial POC mortality, thus altering their contributions to stream shading and structure, nutrient cycling, downed wood, and other functions.	There are probably benefits to some rare plants proportional to decreased infestation acres because of reduced shading and other protection. Also Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 6 road closures reduce noxious weed introductions and trampling. However, some rare plants benefit when nearby cedars die. No negative effects to agency sensitive, threatened, or endangered plants are identified.	Increased temperature in ultramafic areas results in significant coho salmon [ESA listed] and steelhead loss. Less than 5% of coho spawn in ultramafic streams, but temperature increases affect other parts of the system.	Same as Alternatives 1-3.		
Botany	There are no species dependent specifically upon POC, but spotted owl and murrelet are "may affect" because of large-tree losses in habitat. Because pure stands are the exception, other effects are minimal. In Alternatives 3 and 6, late-successional forest-related wildlife benefits from reduced timber harvest, but reduced Late-Successional Reserve thinning could slightly reduce future habitat for these species. Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 possible localized mortality of aquatic species from Chlorox fire-suppression spills or water drops.	No known difference in effects to soil productivity. Small POC mortality-related effect on soil stability, highest in Alternatives 4 and 5, lowest in Alternatives 3 and 6.				
Wildlife	Yew infections will be rare and inconsequential under all alternatives.	POC survival in all alternatives is sufficient to avoid loss of common genes and prevent large scale population divergence. Loss of rare genes possible, not significantly different than natural levels.				
Ultramafic Soils	Good major gene resistance and early fruiting of POC, plus very limited genetic variability in the pathogen, predicts successful development of durable resistant stock for replanting infested areas.					
Genetics	Stock available in all breeding zones within 45 years.					
Resistance	Increased suppression and fuel treatment costs about 2 percent [Alternative 3 and 6 slightly more]. Alternative 3 would reduce access to 51,000 acres and prohibit using timber harvest for fuels treatment on 2,700 acres of wildland-urban interface. Alternative 6 would reduce access to 19,800 acres and prohibit using timber harvest for fuels treatment on 3,240 acres of wildland-urban interface.					
Fire and Fuels	Air quality effects are unquantifiable and inconsequential under all alternatives.					
Air Quality	Negative effects to some users if roads and areas closed; greatest in Alternative 3 and 6. Positive effects to visuals, wilderness, and wild and scenic river values [esthetic] of reduced mortality.					
Recreation, Visual, Wilderness, and Wild and Scenic Rivers	Resistance breeding mitigates esthetic impacts over time, fastest in Alternative 4; not all areas in Alternative 5.					
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern and Research Natural Areas	The risk of an infestation start in the 14 ACECs or RNAs without PL is proportional to the predicted disease spread for each alternative; highest in Alternatives 4 and 5, lowest in Alternatives 3 and 6.					
Cultural Products for Tribes	Insignificant difference between alternatives because of modest levels used and access on other lands.					
Special Forest Products	Current level [4% of bough market], plus firewood and other collections.	Current level of bough collection, and <5% reduction of firewood and other collections.	Current level of bough collection, and slightly more reduction in firewood and other collections than Alternative 2.	Increase of bough harvest by 100 to 200 tons annually, plus slight increase in firewood and other collections from current levels.	Slight increase in bough collection. Reduction in firewood and other collections similar to Alternative 3.	
Timber Harvest	Continue current cost to purchasers of about \$0.80/thousand board feet.	Decrease in PSQ approximately 0.65 million board feet and no thinning in 6,000 Late-Successional Reserve acres.	Removal of current \$0.80/thousand bd ft mitigation costs.	Decrease in PSQ approximately 0.9 million board feet and no thinning in 9,000 Late-Successional Reserve acres.	Continue \$0.80/MBF	
Livestock Grazing	No change.	Incalculable reduction in volume offered.	No effect of PSQ or volume offered.	Possible effects on 3 allotments.		
Mining	Little effect on permit operations.	Could close roads within, but not to, 2 allotments.	No effect on permit operations.			
Direct Costs	Potential cost increases for PL-reducing practices and possibly restoration.	\$932,000	Possible restoration costs.	Same as Alternatives 1-3.		
Environmental Justice and Civil Rights	\$846,000	\$477,000	Job decrease includes 7 timber jobs, a few Asian and Hispanic special forest products collectors.	Probably no effect.	993,000	
Critical Elements	Current level.	Slight job decrease, primarily affecting Asians and Hispanics.	Job decrease includes 7 timber jobs, a few Asian and Hispanic special forest products collectors.	Job increase of 6 related to bough collection.	Job decrease includes 10 timber jobs, a few Asian and Hispanic special forest products collectors.	
Note.	Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 6 could increase energy transmission costs; other effects are included in resource sections above.					
	Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 6 could increase energy transmission costs; other effects are included in resource sections above.					
	The planning area includes 1.5 million acres of Federal lands and 272,000 acres with some level of POC stocking, a projected 34,400 of which are infested with root disease.					

There are approximately 272,000 acres of Federal land containing POC in Oregon, with about 33 percent on high-risk sites (including 13 percent currently infested). The percent of the area in high-risk sites varies across the range, from 20 percent in the northwest where POC is broadly dispersed across the landscape, to 60 percent inland where POC is more concentrated in riparian areas. The management direction in the various alternatives would affect the percentage of high-risk sites that will become infested by the root disease in the future. According to predictions described in the Pathology section of Chapter 3&4, the percentage of currently uninfested high-risk areas that will become infested in the next 100 years is 40, 30, 20, 80, 80, and 18 percent for Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, respectively. From these projections, the POC acreage, percent in high-risk sites, and existing infestation rate, a prediction of the acres and percent of area expected to be infested in 100 years under each alternative can be made (see Table S-2).

The predicted root disease infestation rates and resultant POC mortality have “indirect” effects to various ecosystem processes and values, and these vary by alternative (see Table S-2). It is important to note that these indirect effects do not all occur at once, but occur over the next 100 years as the disease advances into new areas. There are also “direct” effects from the Standards and Guidelines themselves. Closing roads or prohibiting timber harvest directly affects forest users, timber outputs, and jobs. In general across the range of alternatives, as the negative direct effects increase, the negative indirect effects decrease, and vice versa (Table S-2).

Can Any of the Adverse Effects be Mitigated?

Chapter 2 includes a detailed discussion of possible mitigation measures for each of the potential and likely adverse effects identified in the SEIS (Table 2-5). These are generally not part of all alternatives, but were considered by the SEIS Team and could be added to the selected alternative by the decision-makers if they chose. These mitigations include applying parts of other alternatives, mixing Clorox bleach away from streams, improving risk mapping, limiting access and use in POC areas, making exceptions for certain uses, and others.

A long-term “mitigation” is included within Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 6, and particularly Alternative 4; and already under way is a resistance breeding program. (Alternative 5 would discontinue the current breeding program, but continue to use resistance stock in the 26 percent of the breeding zones for which it has already been developed.) The Agencies expect the resistance breeding program to mitigate at least some of the adverse indirect effects in the long term (generally 100 years and longer), as POC planted to replace some of those killed by the disease gradually become large enough to provide significant ecological benefits. Alternative 4 is scheduled to have seed for all breeding zones within 10 years, while Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 6 are scheduled to have seed for all zones within 45 years. Although there are long-term uncertainties in any resistance breeding program, the chance for durable resistance in POC is good because it appears to have major gene resistance, the pathogen itself has a very narrow genetic base indicating a low likelihood of it adapting to kill resistant trees, and POC in seed orchard conditions begins to produce cones as early as age 5, which makes a rapid breeding program possible.

The first resistant POC were field planted in the Biscuit Fire area in November 2003. The ability of resistant seedlings to eventually mitigate disease losses will depend on Agency

funding, time, and on where the Agencies use them. Fortunately, every dead tree need not be replaced by direct planting. POC's propensity for seed production at a relatively young age (around 25 in field conditions) means successful plantings of a few dozen resistant trees in an infested area should be sufficient to begin a cycle of natural regeneration of resistant or partially-resistant stock.

What Factors Will be Used in Making the Decision Between Alternatives?

The BLM State Director and the Forest Supervisor for the Rogue River and Siskiyou NFs will decide which alternatives meet the underlying Need for this proposal. They will also weigh how well each of the alternatives meets the Purpose of slowing the spread of the root disease enough to maintain POC's significant ecological and economic functions, without the cost of the management strategy exceeding its effect on the value of these functions. Since the ecological and economic significance of POC is not a yes/no question, but is best represented as relative value points on a continuum, they will balance two types of information so that a cost/benefit decision can be made about each alternative. The two types of information are addressed in the SEIS by responding to the following two issues:

Question 1. What is the ecological and economic significance of POC in the landscape and how is this affected by various levels of POC mortality?

Considerations include:

- The role of POC in stream function and fish habitat;
- the role of POC in terrestrial habitats for listed, rare, or unique plants;
- the role of POC in terrestrial habitats for listed, rare, or unique animals;
- the role of POC for contemporary Tribal uses;
- the role of POC for boughs and specialty woods;
- the role of POC in maintaining and improving soils;
- whether significant genetic resources are at risk of loss; and
- the role of POC in ecosystem function and the maintenance of significant plant associations.

Question 2. What factors affect the spread of the disease, what management techniques can minimize those factors, and what are the costs and benefits of implementing an appropriate mix of disease-reducing management techniques in terms of (a) direct financial costs, (b) maintaining the ecological and economic value of POC itself, and (c) the positive and negative effects to other (non-POC) resource values or uses?

Considerations include:

- Identification of the current management practices and other factors that may spread the root disease, and their relative importance. These include timber harvest, special forest product collection, off-highway vehicle travel and other recreation activity, mining, fire suppression and fuels treatments, domestic livestock grazing, and activities on private lands.
- Identification of management practices that can reduce disease spread, and their relative effectiveness (these are included in the alternatives).
- Identification of forest uses or management needs that will be constrained by implementation of various management practices, either because of cost or because of reduced access (this is the same list as above).
- Identification of forest resources (other than POC) that will also benefit from implementation of various disease-reducing management practices.

Information about these issues and how each is affected by the alternatives is included in the effects discussions in Chapter 3&4.

What Monitoring is Necessary?

Monitoring is specified as part of each of the alternatives (Chapter 2 and Appendix 5). Where applicable to the specific elements of an alternative, this monitoring includes tracking the success of the resistance breeding program, annual program summaries and evaluation reports, tracking *Phytophthora lateralis* (PL) spread and comparing it to projections in the SEIS, and incorporating POC management requirements in all regularly-scheduled project-implementation monitoring. Pathologists will help evaluate the effectiveness of existing root disease control techniques and help develop others. The Agencies will continue to maintain infestation maps and forest inventories to track progress of the disease.

Which Alternative is the Preferred/Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment?

Based on consideration of the environmental consequences in the final SEIS, Alternative 2 was found to best meet the Purpose and Need, and is the FS Preferred Alternative and the BLM Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment. The clarification of existing management practices, related monitoring and research, plus the addition of the POC Risk Key and the added emphasis on uninfested 7th field watersheds, provides good long-term control of PL. Predicted effects to “Endangered Species Act”-listed species are reduced from what would result under current direction and are not significant, and the Agencies’ ability to consider fuels, forest health, and habitat improvement treatments within the wildland-urban interface and Late-Successional Reserves is retained. Alternative 2 provides the best balance between control and continuation of other forest uses, and therefore best meets the Purpose and Need.